

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

LAW OFFICES OF
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER

A PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS

TENTH FLOOR

1299 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004-2400

TELEPHONE: (202) 508-9500

FACSIMILE: (202) 508-9700

April 3, 1996

RECEIVED

APR - 3 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

ATLANTA OFFICE
SUITE 2400

600 PEACHTREE STREET, N.E.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30308-2222
TELEPHONE (404) 815-2400

CONNECTICUT OFFICE
1055 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD
STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT 06901-2217
TELEPHONE (203) 961-7400

NEW YORK OFFICE
399 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-4697
TELEPHONE (212) 318-6000

TOKYO OFFICE
ARK MORI BUILDING, 30TH FLOOR
P.O. BOX 577
12-32, AKASAKA 1-CHOME
MINATO-KU, TOKYO 107
TELEPHONE (03) 3586-4711

OUR FILE NO.
25101.74560

COUNSEL
LEE G. PAUL
ROBERT P. HASTINGS
LEONARD S. JANOFSKY
CHARLES M. WALKER

LOS ANGELES OFFICE
555 SOUTH FLOWER STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071-2371
TELEPHONE (213) 683-6000

ORANGE COUNTY OFFICE
695 TOWN CENTER DRIVE
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626-1924
TELEPHONE (714) 668-6200

WEST LOS ANGELES OFFICE
1299 OCEAN AVENUE
SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA 90401-1078
TELEPHONE (310) 319-3300

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

(202) 508-9570

VIA MESSENGER

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 222
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: WT Docket No. 96-~~X~~18

Dear Mr. Caton:

On April 2, 1996, Mark Stachiw, Kathleen Abernathy and Carl Northrop, all representing AirTouch Paging, met with Suzanne Toller from the office of Commissioner Chong, Rudy Baca from the office of Commissioner Quello and Jackie Chorney from the office of Chairman Hundt to discuss the interim licensing procedures under consideration in the above-referenced proceeding regarding the transition to a geographic area licensing scheme for paging services.

The AirTouch Paging representatives indicated that there are multiple bases on which to distinguish the paging industry from other segments of the communications industry which have been subjected to freezes, and that the differences permit the Commission to relax the paging freeze on a principled basis. We recommended, consistent with the written comments in which AirTouch Paging participated,^{1/}

^{1/} See Joint Comments and Joint Reply Comments of AACS, AirTouch Paging et al. filed March 1, 1996 and March 11, 1996, respectively.

[Handwritten signature]

PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER

Mr. William F. Caton
April 3, 1996
Page 2

RECEIVED

APR - 3 1996

FEDERAL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION


that the freeze be relaxed in order to allow existing systems to expand into contiguous areas to meet changing public demands. The AirTouch Paging representatives further indicated that the narrowly tailored relief from the freeze they advocated would not encourage application fraud which was a subject of concern in written comments of the FTC.

A hand-out distinguishing the paging freeze from other freezes was distributed. A copy is attached.

Messrs. Stachiw and Northrop also met briefly with David Furth, Chief of the Commercial Wireless Division, and discussed the same topics.

Kindly refer any questions in connection with this matter to the undersigned.

Very truly yours,


Carl W. Northrop

Enclosure

cc: Suzanne Toller, Esquire
Rudy Baca, Esquire
Jackie Chorney, Esquire
David Furth, Chief

DISTINGUISHING THE PAGING FREEZE FROM OTHER FREEZES

	Paging	800 MHz SMR	900 MHz SMR	220 MHz	39 GHz	MMDS
Is there prior FCC precedent lifting freezes affecting the channels based upon public interest findings?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Was the affected industry in the midst of a period of sustained growth at the time of the freeze?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Did the rules in place when the freeze was adopted already contemplate the use of auctions?	Yes*	No	No	No	No	No
Was the freeze adopted as part of a major revision of the rules in addition to a change to market area licensing?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the freeze affect a mature industry found by the Commission to be highly competitive?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Does the freeze apply to all categories of licensees equally?	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Do system expansions into new territory occur on an incremental basis?	Yes	No	No	?	No	No
Are the rule changes under consideration during the freeze necessary to foster competitive equality?	No	Yes	?	No	Yes	Yes
Were rule changes being made to replace a first-come, first served licensing scheme?	No*	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Was application processing at a virtual standstill when the freeze was imposed?	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

* Part 22 only